

REMARKS

After entering the above amendments, claims 1-3, 7, 12-15, and 18-22 will be pending. Reconsideration and allowance of the current application are requested in light of the above-marked amendments and the foregoing remarks.

Summary of Amendments. With this amendment, claims 1, 7, 12, 18, 19, and 21 have been amended. Claims 4-6, 16, and 17 have been canceled. The amendments are merely for clarity and are fully supported by the original specification. No new matter is added with this amendment.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph

Claims 1-7 and 12-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, because the Office alleges that the claims fail to clearly delineate the subject matter that the Inventor(s) intend to claim. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claims 1, 12, and 21 have been amended to correct various antecedent basis and clarity issues identified by the Examiner in the pending Final Office Action in this matter. Notably, with these amendments, the claims more clearly recite that a configuration-specific business scenario is chosen from a plurality of design-time business scenarios and that the business process logic, the routing rules, and the executable mappings of the configuration-specific business scenario are applied to messages sent between a sending application and a receiving application in the active system landscape. Claims whose subject matter had previously been incorporated into other claims have been canceled, and dependent claims 7, 18, and 19 have been amended for consistency with the claims from which they depend. For at least these reasons, withdrawal of the pending rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

On the basis of the foregoing amendments, the pending claims are in condition for allowance. It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed in this paper. However, failure to address a specific rejection, issue or comment, does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above are not intended to be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional claim fees and any additional fees that may be due, or credit any overpayment of same, to Deposit Account No. 50-0311, Reference No. 34874-061/2003P00050US. If there are any questions regarding this reply, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at the telephone number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 25, 2009


Michael D. Van Loy
Reg. No. 52,315

Mintz, Levin, Cohn, Ferris, Glovsky and Popeo, P.C.
3580 Carmel Mountain Road
Suite 300
San Diego, CA 92130
Customer No. 64280
Tel: 858/314-1559
Fax: 858/314-1501